

## **Minutes from a Meeting of the Concordia Council on Student Life**

**Held on May 5<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

**SGW Campus H 769 10:00 am**

**PRESENT:** Mr. Keith Pruden, Chair, Ms. Beverley Morris, Secretary, Ms. H. Ayoubi, Ms. D. Caputo, Mr. R. Côté, Ms. M. Drew, Dr. S. M. Graub, Ms. I. Lacelle, Ms. L. Lipscombe, Mr. R. Lobo, Ms. C. Marshall, Mr. O. Moran, Ms. I. Mort, Ms. B. Mugyenyi, Dr. M. Mulrennan Ms. C. Reimer, Mr. S. Rosenschein, Mr. P. Schiefke, Ms. C. Shaffer, Ms. K. Sheahan, Ms. L. Stanbra, Ms. B. St- Laurent

**DELEGATES:** Mr. Jean-Marc Edwards for Mr. W. Curran

**ABSENT:** Ms. C. Boujaklian, Mr. J. Lachance , Ms. L. Toscano, Ms. J. De Cubellis

**GUESTS:** Mohammed Shuriye, Angela Ghadban, Jane Hackett, Ellie Hummel, Louyse Lussier, many student representatives.

### **1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The Chair indicated that there was one item on the agenda: the approval of the Student Services Budget. A motion to approve the agenda was made by Ms. Lacelle and seconded by Ms. Sheahan.

*The motion was carried unanimously.*

### **2. REMARKS FROM THE CHAIR**

The Chair notified Council that the Student Services Budget would be voted on by ballots that will be distributed and counted by Mr. Shuriye , CSU President and Ms. Morris.

### **3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE MEETING OF APRIL 7<sup>TH</sup>, 2006.**

Mr. Rosenschein enquired as to why the names of persons who brought up specific points were omitted from the minutes with the exception of the Chair and Mr. Côté. He felt that student concerns were 'superficially glossed over', whereas arguments in favor of increasing the fees were written clearly. He requested that his comments on accessible education be put into the minutes.

The Chair responded that there would be no problem retroactively revising the minutes and that Mr. Rosenschein was welcome to provide details to be included in the revised minutes. Mr. Rosenschein agreed to do so.

Ms. Mugyenyi requested that her question to Mr. Côté, (aside from increases to student fees, were other sources of revenue explored to cover the deficit in the budget?), be added to the minutes.

Mr. Moran requested the following changes to the minutes under Item 4.1 Campus Wellness:

*Mr. Moran remarked that the group has decided on a vision: “A health –enhancing culture. A health-enhancing environment. Healthy Concordians.” They have defined health as follows: Health is a resource. It is a way of doing and being that encourages and supports the setting and achievement of goals. Mr. Moran reiterated the mission ... there would be a list of all resources, by department and by topics, and possibly an events calendar. They would ideally like to have something for September 2006. There would also be a small printed booklet that could be picked up at CSU, Heath Services, and other locations across campus.”*

A motion to approve the minutes as revised was made by Ms. Drew, and seconded by Ms. Ayoubi.

*The motion was carried unanimously*

#### **4. STUDENT SERVICES BUDGET**

The Chair notified Council that there is a prepared motion for approval of the budget. Mr. Côté stated that this revised version of the motion reflects a \$ 0.20 reduction in the Student Services fee in each year of the proposed operating budget. The following motion was made by Mr. Côté, and seconded by Dr. Mulrennan:

*BIRT CCSL adopt a three-year budget (document attached) with a Student Services fee of \$ 9.73 per credit for the 2006-07 fiscal year, of \$ 9.95 per credit for the 2007-08 fiscal year, and of \$ 10.26 per credit for the 2008-09 fiscal year.*

*Should additional revenues be transferred to Student Services, the fee will be reduced by a proportionate amount.*

Following concerns posed by Council the Chair clarified that both minute taking devices were functional.

Ms. Mugyenyi addressed the fact that Council would be voting by secret ballot and requested that the votes be taken openly as students gathered at the meeting would like an open process whereby they can be included. Mr. Rosenshein agreed stating that a decision affecting 27,000 individuals should be transparent. Mr. Côté remarked that if Council members requested a vote by ballot their request should be considered and furthermore, voting by ballot does not remove transparency or the opportunity for any member to vote.

The Chair clarified that Council would be voting by ballot; not by 'secret' ballot. He stated that following requests made directly to him by several members of Council for a vote by ballot, he ruled that the vote would be by ballot. He indicated that if Council wished to challenge his ruling a motion to do so could be made. Following some discussion, a motion to overrule the Chair's ruling for a vote by ballot was made by Mr. Rosenshein, and seconded by Ms. Marshall.

*The motion was defeated; 5 in favor, 10 opposed, 2 abstentions.*

The Chair returned the floor to the motion on the budget. Mr. Côté explained that the reduction of \$0.20 reflects the removal of proposed space enhancement initiatives at Loyola. He reiterated that the proposal to increase the budget is predicated on what is required by Student Services to adequately respond to student needs. Council is required to make an informed decision based on the reasons for the adjustments as well as the implications of not making those adjustments. To that end, a document circulated to Council on May 4<sup>th</sup>, gave details of the implications of budget cuts on each service unit. The primary motive for the increase is the adjustments in salaries resulting from the University's collective bargaining agreements. There are some areas with projected increases in expenses in order to respond to increased demand, namely the ISO and Financial Aid & Awards offices. Mr. Côté invited the Directors of each of the four sectors in Student Services to speak.

Ms. Drew reiterated that 97% of increased expenses for Health Services is due to labor negotiations as the majority of their staff are professionals. She indicated that any cuts to the budget would directly impact patient care. There has been a 40% increase in patient visits to Health Services in the past three years with the number of visits going from 22,000 to 32,000 per year. This implies a need for service that may be due to the fact that external shortages of resources, (hospitals etc.), causes many students, staff and faculty to use Health Services. The specialized mental health care is of most concern, as these services would have to be eliminated. Also of concern is the fact that waiting times will increase. Although the projected fee (\$9.73) will enable them to maintain services currently offered, the department was nonetheless required to close one position as a method of constraint. The proposed fee does not allow for new services to be implemented.

Ms. Stanbra spoke of the well-known line-ups at FAAO with a current average wait time of approximately 23 minutes that rises to over three hours during peak times. The department distributes 60 million dollars annually via the 30,000 aid disbursements and receives 42,000 visits to the office. If the budget were not increased the department would lose five staff members, thereby directly impacting an already taxing wait time. There would be delays in financial needs assessment as well as in disbursing financial aid to students. The positions of individuals who verify the many supporting documents required for their operation would be cut. The amount requested in the budget is adequate to provide essential and necessary resources for students.

Dr. Graub stated that Counseling and Development is a large department with four areas of service on the SGW campus and two at Loyola. The department is very well used and registers 99,000 student visits. If the fee -which may cost students a coffee per day- is not increased there will be a cut of 52 student workers in the learning center as it is the one area that is not covered by any collective agreement. Due to a lack of funding, the hiring of student workers for the learning center is currently on hold. Although student reps at CCSL may not use the center themselves, they are speaking on behalf of students who may need the kind of assistance offered by the learning center. Also noteworthy is the fact that it took a long time to obtain the current level of support from Faculty. Faculty members are now requesting assistance from the department and, unfortunately, this is also on hold due to lack of funding. The position of a contractual career advisor assigned to the Loyola campus, who manages all of the career needs of science students and organizes the annual career science fair, would be lost without the increase to the fees.

Dr. David Bernards requested to speak; however, the Chair advised that Dr. Bernards is not a member of Council and does not have speaking privileges.

Ms. St-Laurent spoke on behalf of Support Services, indicating that with a fee of \$6.90 there would be drastic cuts for OSD and ISO- two offices instrumental in student success that embody the notion of accessibility. The lack of an increase would mean closing down the Student Advocate Program, which would mean no representation for graduate students, the legal information service would be closed; there would be a decrease in the number of advisors available to service the 750 students at the OSD. There would be no funding for a full time receptionist or a coordinator. There would be drastic delays for students.

Ms. Lacelle indicated that the ISO is very busy servicing 5,000 International students and in the past academic year the department recorded 21,000 visits. The office recently began administering a new government work permit program where students will be allowed to work off campus. This project is expected to generate an additional 6,000 visits within the next year. The department is currently short staffed; as such not approving the proposed increases to the budget will mean the loss of student advisors. At present, international students do not require an appointment to visit the office. They simply come by the office directly for assistance. Often new students come shortly after their arrival to Montreal, often with their luggage in tow. The lack of funding will mean a significant change for these students, as support for them will be delayed. It has taken twelve to fourteen years to build the ISO to its current status as one of the best in the country. The services offered by the other universities in the city are much less than what is offered at Concordia. Ms. Lacelle felt that it is quite sad that Concordia will be forced to offer international students fewer services.

Ms. Shaffer requested speaking privileges for students at the meeting who are not members of Council. Following some discussion a motion to grant speaking privileges to all students present at the meeting was made by Ms. Mugyenyi and seconded by Mr. Rosenshein.

The Chair indicated that the condition for speaking privileges would be that comments remained on the topic of the motion. He added that individuals granted speaking privileges identify themselves so as to ensure accuracy in the minutes.

*The motion was carried unanimously*

Dr. Bernards, President of the GSA, challenged the idea that CCSL cannot present an unbalanced budget to the BOG stating that other areas in the University are running deficits that are absorbed by the University. The same can be done for important services for students. He suggested the services sector stand in solidarity against increasing the student fees. However, if Council insisted upon increasing the fees, Dr. Bernards asked that the normal procedure of the GSA regarding fee approval be respected. The GSA's constitution requires a referendum for fee approval. The GSA was unaware of a fee increase prior to the April 7<sup>th</sup> meeting therefore a referendum was not held. He reminded Council that in 1997 CCSL made a decision to institute a capital campaign fee that was ultimately rejected by student vote. He requested that Council wait to approve the fee increase until the GSA holds a referendum. Otherwise the CCSL approved budget can be brought to the BOG without GSA approval.

The Chair informed Council that there are a number of mechanisms in place for approving fees. Student association fees are generally approved by referenda within their associations; then the fees are forwarded to the BOG for ratification. Student Services fees are approved by CCSL; there is no requirement for a referendum. All fees, whether approved by referenda, by Council, or by any other body, have to be ratified by the BOG. The BOG is the only body that can authorize the collection of student fees.

Mr. Rosenshein stated that the Directors repeating the importance of their services is moot as all of Council agrees that the services are essential to students. There are two points on which Council agrees: post-secondary educational institutions are dramatically under-funded and; that services offered to students are important. Council should be debating where the money ought to come from. It should not come from students; furthermore it is outrageous for students to pay the increased fee when the services will not be improved. Examples of universities in other provinces show that the fees have increased while government funding has decreased, creating a situation where students received the same, if not worse service whilst paying more money. This increase is going to make it more difficult for many students to come to the University. Also, the justification for the increase (student services facing a deficit) may lead other departments to follow suit. There is money available beyond the budget for the Student Services sector as is evidenced by the fact that the University has spent money in other areas; (new Vice-President's salary of \$300,000-400,000 per year and new offices being built). As a student, Mr. Rosenshein is personally opposed to the increase. It would be more useful for Council to discuss how to lobby the administration to provide subsidy for the sector.

Ms. Drew indicted comparisons between provinces cannot be made as funding models are not the same. For example, in some provinces, the public health department or the regional health authority pays the salary for the nursing staff; this is not the case in Montreal. Ms. Drew argued that while she understood students' concerns about the cost and accessibility of education, she does not understand why the student association fees have increased from \$2.60 in 1997-98 to \$ 7.98 today. Morally it is difficult to argue the point when the student association fees have increased. The increased fee reflects the reality of the current situation which is that the increase is necessary in order to ensure services and resources are available to all those who need them.

Mr. Côté supports the idea of expanding the value placed on higher education and services provided to students by the government. He feels that the proposal before Council responds to this idea. The pursuit of alternative funding, either from the government or the University, is not an option that will generate funds for June 1, 2006. The current objective is to ensure that Student Services has the resources to respond to student needs. The financial framework within which the University and Student Services operates is such that the Quebec government considers Student Services as a non-admissible. Therefore the University cannot make claims to the government for the Student Services sector as it does for the rest of the University's staff. The government grant itemized for Student Services is the government contribution for Student Services in universities across Quebec. The proposed budget is projected within that framework and does not afford the University enough resources to meet the demands of Student Services. Revising that framework is something that can be discussed in the long term, however in the interim there is no alternative solution to handling current needs. Until there is an alternative it is essential that resources are available to provide services. Once this is dealt with, CCSL can continue working on the other suggestions.

Mr. Rosenshein responded to comments made by Ms. Drew stating that one of the principle reasons for the student association fee increase is that necessary services have been introduced over the years, an example is the advocacy center. Another significant reason for the increase is that many projects that should have been funded by the administration were not. It is correct that the frameworks are different across provinces however, the general principle of the government using increased student contribution in order to reduce their own contribution is held across the board in every province.

Mr. Noah Stewart, student representative on the CSU, agreed that all services mentioned are essential, however it is also vital that students are able to attend University. According to Mr. Stewart, seventy percent of people who do not attend University cite finances as the reason. Access to education and services to students are both indispensable, however one cannot be circumvented for the other. The solution to providing services is not to raise student fees, especially given that Concordia has the highest ancillary fees of any other University in Quebec. He also felt that the fact that the fee increase has not been brought to CSU council, and that the CSU had no mandate to approve the fee, should affect Council's decision.

Ms. Veronica Lorne, VP Internal GSA, requested further clarification on the financial needs of the Health Services department. Health Services is not specific to students and is used by faculty and staff; therefore she questioned why students solely would be charged for the financial needs of the department.

Ms. Drew indicated that the University contributes to Health Services covering all of the cost for faculty and staff. Eighty percent of visits to Health Services are from students, while only 20% is from staff and faculty. Ms. Drew added that a year ago a request for additional funding was made based on the average cost of a visit to Health Services. The University is contributing its portion and a fair portion so that students are not being penalized.

Ms. Mugyenyi expressed concern that the amount of the fee as well as the number of fees is increasing. Quebec's freeze on tuition fee increases is being undermined by the CCSL proposed fee increase as well as by Concordia's high ancillary fees. It appears to Ms. Mugyenyi that students are being asked to shoulder the University's debt. CCSL exists to have student opinion and student input, however the representatives here cannot say what students want without having a referendum. Ninety percent of students voted against student fee increases in the last referendum and the impression is that this is not something that students want. Moreover, it is incredibly poor financial planning to rest the jobs of employees in Student Services on a vote that may or may not pass. It was well known that the collective bargaining agreements were coming due and there should have been back up plans beyond increasing fees. Her opinion is that there has to be a referendum to ask students about this fee.

Mr. Moran indicated that students could opt out of the other fees that they have, which can mean a reduction of up to \$75 per year. For those in need of Financial Aid, this is a factor in their application for assistance and they would get extra money for that reduction. This implies that students in greatest financial need would be supported. He added that it is also important to keep perspective on the actual amount of the fee increase. The increase of \$2.83 for a full time student would come out to \$100.00 per year; which would mean an additional \$11.00 per month.

Ms. Marshall agreed with all that has been said, however, she feels the increase is expensive. Students are not convinced that CCSL will actively endeavor to find other sources of funding before the next budget term. If Council wants the budget passed, a commitment needs to be made that more is going to be done to ensure that the fees are not further increased.

Mr. Rosenshein reiterated the need to seek other sources of funding, stating that Concordia prides itself on accessibility by endorsing programs such as "adopt a student" which is not reconcilable with increasing cost to students.

Ms. Sheahan stated that Student Services is the only sector that has not increased its fees in nine years; demonstrating that unless it is absolutely necessary student fees will not increase. Student Services has found other ways to minimize the burden on the student

fee through the growth in student bodies and by tapping into innovations. This speaks to the sector's credibility. There is therefore integrity to the commitment that is being put forward because of the sector's proven track record.

Dr. Mulrennan pointed out that it is important to keep in mind that accessibility is not the only issue. There is also a moral responsibility to ensure that students succeed once they are in the University. Many of the services at issue are essential, it is not merely about preventing students from coming; it is also about ensuring that they can succeed once they are here.

Brent Farrington, student representative on the BOG, added that students recognize that there has been a lot of effort in trying to maintain services and they are also aware that the fee has not increased in nine years. Their concern is the fact that the University (and the services sector) consistently balances its budget while other universities in the province do not and receive subsidy from the government (e.g. the University of Laval has a \$ 250 million deficit and has been consistently bailed out by the Quebec government). Concordia has decided to run a deficit this year (9.5 million) because it is frustrated that the government consistently bails out other universities. Mr. Farrington stated that he recognizes the need for a fee increase, however CCSL should be seeking funding from other sources. There is a strong and solid commitment from the student governance to help find other resources. Mr. Farrington offered to bring forward a motion to the BOG to change funds in the budget such that the University incurs a greater deficit and allocates more money into Student Services. He further indicated that Mr. Shuriye, who sits on the University budget committee, would second his motion. Mr. Farrington feels strongly that it is not the appropriate time to request an increase to the student fee.

The Chair thanked Mr. Farrington for offering to make the motion at the BOG meeting. He reminded Council that the motion being considered contains a provision that if additional funding is secured, the fee will be reduced by a proportionate amount.

Ms. Mugyenyi indicated that she understands the concerns of all the Directors. She reiterated that the debate should be about where the money comes from. She voiced her concern that the University would simply increase the fee again to fund future deficits and she added that there is need for guidelines for the means by which the fees can be increased.

Dr. Shaver responded to Mr. Farrington's point by stating that his point seems to be in support of the motion. The motion states that the fee has to be increased in the short term in order to resolve the problems currently being experienced by the sector. The motion also has a stipulation that if other money is acquired the fees will be reduced proportionately, thus addressing both issues that have been brought up. Dr. Shaver reiterated that CCSL's commitment is demonstrated by the nine year freeze on the fees which means that they are going to, and are willing to work hard at finding other sources of funding. While Dr. Shaver appreciated what students have said, she further pointed out that student representatives have not voiced any solutions that would address the immediate financial concerns. Whatever decision Council makes, both issues need to be

addressed and the motion put forward by Mr. Côté addresses both short and long-term concerns.

Mr. Côté clarified that the cost of the collective agreements was not known beforehand. Departments were informed that the increase would be significant, however the services sector did not know what the specifics were until last spring. Departments were told what the amount might be, but there was no specific amount committed to the increases. In fact, there were many changes throughout the winter to certain provisions. For example, the benefits rates were indexed by 3.5% over and above the existing rates. An indexation of that amount on a 6 million dollar budget is a lot of money; therefore no one in the University knew what the exact amount of the increases would be. The information would have been supplied in advance if it were available. Mr. Côté added that the reasons why the Directors are making known where they could make compression is because of obligations to permanent employees. Even if Directors wanted to compress expenses by cutting programs run by permanent employees it cannot be done; the service could be cut, however the employee would still have to be paid. The only areas that can be cut are where students are vulnerable and on the non-salary. There have been cuts of up to half on the non-salary and there will be more compressions if the fee of 9.73 is not approved.

Ms. Shaffer echoed what all the students said: that the money is needed and the services are essential. However, the problem is that there are no guarantees that if the fee is approved there will be a strong effort to seek other funding. Students do not feel confident about that. Also, the crisis situation was not made known to the GSA beforehand. There should have been an effort to consult with the GSA because this fee also affects them. The minutes of March 3<sup>rd</sup> says that there was an invitation to meet with Mr. Côté, however the GSA did not receive an invitation. The GSA found out about the fee increase when the minutes were distributed on March 31<sup>st</sup>, which was only seven days before the meeting when CCSL was to vote on the fee. The budget itself was not received until two days before the meeting. Given that GSA was not consulted there was no way for them to be able to work with Student Services to develop a plan for the budget. Ms. Shaffer appreciates the necessity of all the services and the increases to the fee, however she is not in favor of the process by which this was developed.

Mr. Rosenshein stated that he does not remember an instance in which fees have ever gone down. Therefore he is uncomfortable with increasing the fee with the provision of finding alternative funding and then reducing the fee. He is certain that students would not feel comfortable with that either. He feels that Mr. Farrington's solution is a concrete short-term solution. He feels there is a sincere effort on students' parts to look for alternatives unlike the effort on the part of the University. In terms of the Student Services sector not having increased the fees in the past nine years being a sign of their commitment, his understanding is that one of the major reasons the fee did not have increased is because enrollments had increased by 40%. Otherwise the fee would have already been increased, the fact that the fee was not increased is not a sign of the commitment; it is merely a reflection of the increased enrolment.

Mr. Côté agreed that enrolments did increase, however so did the cost of the service. Enrolments also increased for all of the University not only for Student Services. Mr. Côté also clarified that the invitation to go over the budget was made to CCSL and a number of members took the invitation and scheduled meetings. There were no invitations outside of the forum of Council and there was no intent of excluding anyone.

The commitment towards a revised financial framework in the future is an issue that CCSL should look into. It would be best if all of CCSL were to come up with alternatives especially given CCSL's direct link to the BOG. Council can commit to pursuing alternatives for the future either by creating subcommittees, or task forces. Mr. Côté's concern is that such a commitment has an inherent risk of not coming to fruition by June 1<sup>st</sup>. Questions arise as to how to respond to students requiring service as of June 1<sup>st</sup>. These concerns need to be addressed and should be done collectively through CCSL, rather than asking the Directors.

Mr. Moran responded to Ms. Shaffer by stating that there is equally no guarantee that there will be a search for alternative sources of funding if the fee increase is not approved. The only thing that is guaranteed if there is no fee increase, services will be cut and students will be deprived. Mr. Moran stated that he is not hearing any new ideas and time is moving and so he asked how would Council move to a vote.

The Chair indicated that a mover and a second could call a vote at anytime. There were still two people on the speaker list, and Council should be moving towards a vote.

Ms. Shaffer indicated that she was confused by the minutes of March 3<sup>rd</sup>. She was unclear as to when the verbal invitation was extended and when the two meetings between student representatives and Student Services were held. The GSA should have been sought out given that they were going to be asked to vote on a fee increase. She reiterated that the GSA had no opportunity to try to seek out a meeting with Student Services and furthermore had she been aware that there was to be a vote on the fee increase she certainly would have sought out a meeting with Student Services. The GSA was presented with a budget at the April 7<sup>th</sup> meeting that they were required to vote on with no prior knowledge of the meeting.

Ms. Mugyenyi agreed with Ms. Shaffer stating that the invitation that was extended to CCSL did not clearly indicate that the meeting was about a fee increase, as is reflected in the minutes. If anything it was thought of as general meeting. Ms. Mugyenyi felt that if Ms. Shaffer and herself had any inclination that there was going to be an increase to the fee they would have been very involved. Ms. Mugyenyi brought forward an amendment to the motion:

*Be it resolved that a strong commitment be made to find external funding for Student Services, to lobby the University for a transfer of funds from the administration to Student Services; and that upon receipt of these funds ensure that they are applied to Student Services, upon which the student fee would be proportionately reduced.*

The Chair asked if the amendment was friendly to the mover. Mr. Côté clarified with Ms. Mugyenyi that the amendment was to be added to the motion on the table. Ms. Mugyenyi agreed. After some discussion as to the wording of the motion, a friendly amendment to the original motion was agreed upon as follows:

*Be it resolved that CCSL adopt a three-year budget (document attached) with a Student Services fee of \$ 9.73 per credit for the 2006-07 fiscal year, of \$9.95 per credit for the 2007-08 fiscal year, and of \$10.26 per credit for the 2008-09 fiscal year.*

*Be it resolved that a strong commitment be made to find external funding for Student Services, to lobby the University for a transfer of funds from the administration to Student Services; and that upon receipt of these funds ensure that they are applied to Student Services, upon which the student fee would be proportionately reduced.*

Mr. Stewart asked how this new motion would be brought to the board. Mr. Côté informed that if additional revenues are found, CCSL would bring a resolution to the BOG to reduce the fees, to be enacted when the additional revenues are committed.

After some discussion, council agreed to vote using the ballots as they were written with the understanding that the motion is amended in the minutes.

Ms. Mugyenyi wished to state for the record that she is wholeheartedly opposed to voting in favor of the fee increase. The reason she has applied a friendly amendment to the motion is that in the event the fee increase passes, the amended motion would be a better situation for students.

The Chair requested Council to proceed to a vote. The ballots were distributed, collected and counted by Mr. Shuriye of the CSU and Ms. Morris. Council took a short break during which the ballots were counted. The Chair recalled the meeting to order.

*The motion was carried: 14 in favor, 5 opposed, 1 abstention.*

The Chair indicated that the motion would be presented to the BOG as soon as possible. He stated that this is the final meeting of Council for the year and he thanked everyone for their service; particularly in dealing with the budget increase. He asked if there were any other comments to be addressed. Ms. Mugyenyi indicated that the GSA wished to bring forward a motion regarding the budget and wondered if the discussions could remain open.

Following some discussion, Council agreed that the Budget and Funding sub-committee be established, as a parity committee chaired by Mr. Côté. The mandate of the committee shall be to actively search for alternative sources of funding for Student Services, in accordance with the stipulations of second paragraph of the motion passed at CCSL on May 5<sup>th</sup>, 2006.

*The motion was carried unanimously*

The Chair declared constitution of the Budget and Funding subcommittee.

**5. NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting will be held in September 2006.

**6. TERMINATION OF THE MEETING**

A motion to terminate the meeting was made by Ms. Reimer, and seconded by Ms. Drew.

*The motion was carried unanimously*